arXiv:1402.6064v1 [math.PR] 25 Feb 2014

Joint CLT for several random sesquilinear forms with applications to large-dimensional spiked population models

Qinwen Wang* **and Jianfeng Yao†**

Qinwen Wang
Department of Mathematics
Zhejiang University
e-mail: wqw8813@gmail.com

Jianfeng Yao
Department of Statistics and Actuarial Science
The University of Hong Kong
Pokfulam, Hong Kong
e-mail: jeffyao@hku.hk

Abstract: In this paper, we derive a joint central limit theorem for random vector whose components are function of random sesquilinear forms. This result is a natural extension of the existing central limit theory on random quadratic forms. We also provide applications in random matrix theory related to large-dimensional spiked population models. For the first application, we find the joint distribution of grouped extreme sample eigenvalues corresponding to the spikes. And for the second application, under the assumption that the population covariance matrix has only one simple spike, we derive the asymptotic joint distribution of the largest sample eigenvalue and its corresponding sample eigenvector projection.

AMS 2000 subject classifications: Primary 60F05; secondary 60B20.
Keywords and phrases: Random sesqulinear form, Random quadratic form, Large-dimensional sample covariance matrices, Spiked population model, Extreme eigenvalues, Extreme eigenvectors, Central limit theorem, Joint distribution.

1. Introduction

The aim of this paper is to derive the joint central limit theorem of a new type of random vector whose components are made with several groups of random sesquilinear forms. To be more specific, we consider a sequence $\{(x_i, y_i)_{i\in N}\}$ of iid. complex-valued, zero-mean random vector belonging to $\mathbb{C}^K \times \mathbb{C}^K$ (K fixed) with a finite moment of fourth-order. For positive integer $n \geq 1$, write

$$x_i = (x_{1i}, \cdots, x_{Ki})^T, \quad X(l) = (x_{l1}, \cdots, x_{ln})^T \ (1 \leq l \leq K) \ , \tag{1.1}$$

*Research of this author was partly supported by the National Natural Science Foundation of China (Grant No. 11071213), the Natural Science Foundation of Zhejiang Province (No. R6090034), and the Doctoral Program Fund of Ministry of Education (No. J20110031).
†Research of this author was partly supported by GRF Grant HKU 705413P.

with a similar definition for the vectors $\{y_i\}$ and $\{Y(l)\}_{1\le l\le K}$. The covariance between x_{l1} and y_{l1} is denoted as $\rho(l) = E[\overline{x}_{l1}y_{l1}]$, $1 \le l \le K$. Let $\{A_n = [a_{ij}(n)]\}_n$ and $\{B_n = [b_{ij}(n)]\}_n$ be two sequences of $n \times n$ Hermitian matrices, and define

$$U(l) := \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}\left[X(l)^* A_n Y(l) - \rho(l) tr A_n\right] , \tag{1.2}$$
$$V(l) := \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}\left[X(l)^* B_n Y(l) - \rho(l) tr B_n\right] .$$

We are studying the joint central limit theorem of the $2K$-dimensional complex-valued random vector:

$$\big(U(1), \cdots, U(K), V(1), \cdots, V(K)\big)^T .$$

If we use only one sequence of Hermitian matrix, say $\{A_n\}$ and consider one form ($K = 1$), then the problem reduces to the central limit theorem of a simple random sesquilinear form:

$$U(1) := \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}\left[X(1)^* A_n Y(1) - \rho(1) tr A_n\right] .$$

If we further impose $Y \equiv X$, we obtain a classical random quadratic form

$$U^*(1) := \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}\left[X(1)^* A_n X(1) - \rho(1) tr A_n\right]$$

with independent random variables.

There exists an extensive literature on the asymptotic distribution of quadratic form $U^*(1)$. The pioneering work in this area dates back to Sevastyanov (1961), who deals principally with the case when the variables X have normal distribution. This CLT is extended to arbitrary iid. components in X by Whittle (1964), with additional conditions on the matrix A; In particular, A has a zero diagonal (i.e quadratic form: $\tilde{U}(1) := \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} X(1)^* A_n X(1)$). Later extensions deal with other types of limiting theorem (functional CLT, law of iterated logarithm) or dependent random variables in X, see: Rotar' (1973), De Jong (1987), Fox and Taqqu (1987), Mikosch (1991) and Jakubowski and Memin (1994) for reference.

In a different area, Pan et al (2008) and Hachem et al (2013) established the asymptotic behavior of quadratic form and bilinear form, where $A = S_n$ is the sample covariance matrix and $A = (M_n - zI)^{-1}$ is the resolvent of some large dimensional random matrix M_n, respectively. Such CLT can be used in the areas of wireless communications and electrical engineering.

In the paper of Bai and Yao (2008), the authors derived the central limit theorem for $U(l)$ in (1.2) (i.e with one group of sesquilinear forms) in their Appendix as a tool for establishing the central limit theory for the extreme sample eigenvalues when the population has the spiked covariance structure.

In this paper, we follow the lines and strategy that put forward in Bai and Yao (2008), and extend this CLT to arbitrary number of groups of random sesquilinear forms, which is presented in Section 2. Indeed, this extension has been motivated by applications in the field of random matrix theory related to the spiked

population model. When the population has a spiked covariance structure, we establish the asymptotic joint distribution of any two groups of extreme sample eigenvalues that corresponding to the spikes. Besides, when the population has only one simple spike, we find the joint distribution of the largest sample eigenvalue and its corresponding sample eigenvector projection using our main result. All these applications are developed in Section 3. Section 4 contains the proofs of the theorems in Section 3. And the last Section contains some additional technical lemmas.

2. Main result: central limit theorem for random sesquilinear forms

Theorem 2.1. *Let* $\{A_n = [a_{ij}(n)]\}_n$ *and* $\{B_n = [b_{ij}(n)]\}_n$ *be two sequences of* $n \times n$ *Hermitian matrices and the vector* $\{X(l), Y(l)\}_{1\le l\le K}$ *be defined as in* (1.1)*. Assume that the following limits exists:*

$$w_1 = \lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{n}\sum_{u=1}^{n} a_{uu}^2(n) \ , \quad w_2 = \lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{n}\sum_{u=1}^{n} b_{uu}^2(n) \ ,$$

$$w_3 = \lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{n}\sum_{u=1}^{n} a_{uu}(n)b_{uu}(n) \ ,$$

$$\theta_1 = \lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{n}\sum_{u,v=1}^{n} |a_{uv}(n)|^2 \ , \quad \theta_2 = \lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{n}\sum_{u,v=1}^{n} |b_{uv}(n)|^2 \ ,$$

$$\theta_3 = \lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{n}\sum_{u,v=1}^{n} a_{uv}(n)b_{vu}(n) \ ,$$

$$\tau_1 = \lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{n}\sum_{u,v=1}^{n} a_{uv}(n)^2 \ , \quad \tau_2 = \lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{n}\sum_{u,v=1}^{n} b_{uv}(n)^2 \ ,$$

$$\tau_3 = \lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{n}\sum_{u,v=1}^{n} a_{uv}(n)b_{uv}(n) \ .$$

Denote

$$A_1 = \mathbb{E}(\overline{x}_{l1}y_{l1}\overline{x}_{l'1}y_{l'1}) - \rho(l)\rho(l^{'}) \ ,$$
$$A_2 = \mathbb{E}(\overline{x}_{l1}\overline{x}_{l'1})E(y_{l1}y_{l'1}) \ ,$$
$$A_3 = \mathbb{E}(\overline{x}_{l1}y_{l'1})E(\overline{x}_{l'1}y_{l1}) \ .$$

And let

$$U(l) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}\big[X(l)^* A_n Y(l) - \rho(l) tr A_n\big] \ ,$$
$$V(l) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}\big[X(l)^* B_n Y(l) - \rho(l) tr B_n\big] \ ,$$

then, the $2K$*-dimensional complex-valued random vector:*

$$\big(U(1), \cdots, U(K), V(1), \cdots, V(K)\big)^T$$

converges weakly to a zero-mean complex-valued vector W whose real and imaginary parts are Gaussian. Moreover, the Laplace transform of W is given by

$$\mathbb{E}\exp\left(\begin{pmatrix}c\\d\end{pmatrix}^T W\right)=\exp\left[\frac{1}{2}\begin{pmatrix}c\\d\end{pmatrix}^T B\begin{pmatrix}c & d\end{pmatrix}\right],\qquad c,d\in\mathbb{C}^K\ ,$$

where B could be expressed as

$$B=\begin{pmatrix}B_{11} & B_{12}\\ B_{21} & B_{22}\end{pmatrix}_{2K\times 2K},$$

each block is a $K\times K$ matrices $(\,l,l^{'}=1,\cdots,K)$ with entries:

$$\begin{aligned}B_{11}(l,l^{'})&=Cov\,(U(l),U(l^{'}))=w_1A_1+(\tau_1-w_1)A_2+(\theta_1-w_1)A_3\ ,\\ B_{22}(l,l^{'})&=Cov\,(V(l),V(l^{'}))=w_2A_1+(\tau_2-w_2)A_2+(\theta_2-w_2)A_3\ ,\\ B_{12}(l,l^{'})&=Cov\,(U(l),V(l^{'}))=w_3A_1+(\tau_3-w_3)A_2+(\theta_3-w_3)A_3\ .\end{aligned}$$

Proof. (proof of Theorem 2.1) It is sufficient to establish the CLT for the linear combinations of random Hermitian sesquilinear forms:

$$\sum_{l=1}^{K}[c_lX(l)^*A_nY(l)+d_lX(l)^*B_nY(l)]\ ,$$

where the coefficients $(c_l),(d_l)\in\mathbb{C}^K\times\mathbb{C}^K$ are arbitrary. Also, it holds that

$$\mathbb{E}[X(l)^*A_nY(l)]=\rho(l)trA_n\ ,\qquad \mathbb{E}[X(l)^*B_nY(l)]=\rho(l)trB_n\ .$$

We use the moment method as in Bai and Yao (2008). Define

$$\eta_n=\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}\sum_{l=1}^{K}\left\{c_l[X(l)^*A_nY(l)-\rho(l)trA_n]+d_l[X(l)^*B_nY(l)-\rho(l)trB_n]\right\}\ ,$$

then we can expand η_n as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}\eta_n &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}\sum_{l=1}^{K}\Big\{c_l\big[\sum_{u=1}^{n}(X(l)_u^*Y(l)_u-\rho(l))a_{uu}+\sum_{u\neq v}X(l)_u^*Y(l)_va_{uv}\big]\\ &\quad +d_l\big[\sum_{u=1}^{n}(X(l)_u^*Y(l)_u-\rho(l))b_{uu}+\sum_{u\neq v}X(l)_u^*Y(l)_vb_{uv}\big]\Big\}\\ &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}\sum_{e=(u,v)}\Big\{\sum_{l=1}^{K}\big[(c_l\overline{x}_{lu}y_{lu}-c_l\rho(l))a_{uu}+c_l\overline{x}_{lu}y_{lv}a_{uv}\big]\\ &\quad +\sum_{l=1}^{K}\big[(d_l\overline{x}_{lu}y_{lu}-d_l\rho(l))b_{uu}+d_l\overline{x}_{lu}y_{lv}b_{uv}\big]\Big\}\\ &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}\sum_{e}(a_e\psi_e+b_e\varphi_e)\ ,\end{aligned}$$

where e is an edge associated with vertex u and v, i.e. $e = (u, v) \in \{1, \cdots, n\}^2$; and

$$\psi_e \triangleq \begin{cases} \sum_{l=1}^K c_l(\overline{x}_{lu} y_{lu} - \rho(l)) \ , & u = v \ , \\ \sum_{l=1}^K c_l \overline{x}_{lu} y_{lv} \ , & u \neq v \ , \end{cases} \tag{2.1}$$

$$\varphi_e \triangleq \begin{cases} \sum_{l=1}^K d_l(\overline{x}_{lu} y_{lu} - \rho(l)) \ , & u = v \ , \\ \sum_{l=1}^K d_l \overline{x}_{lu} y_{lv} \ , & u \neq v \ . \end{cases} \tag{2.2}$$

Then

$$\begin{aligned} n^{\frac{K}{2}} \eta_n^K &= \sum_{e_1 \cdots e_K} (a_{e_1} \psi_{e_1} + b_{e_1} \varphi_{e_1}) \cdots (a_{e_K} \psi_{e_K} + b_{e_K} \varphi_{e_K}) \\ &= \sum_{G_1 \bigcup G_2} a_{G_1} \psi_{G_1} b_{G_2} \varphi_{G_2} \ , \end{aligned} \tag{2.3}$$

where

$$a_{G_1} = \prod_{e \in G_1} a_e \ , \quad \psi_{G_1} = \prod_{e \in G_1} \psi_e \ , \quad b_{G_2} = \prod_{e \in G_2} b_e \ , \quad \varphi_{G_2} = \prod_{e \in G_2} \varphi_e \ .$$

To each sum in equation (2.3), we associate a directed graph G by drawing an arrow $u \to v$ for each factor $e_j = (u, v)$. We denote G_1 as a subgraph of G corresponding to the coefficients being $a\psi$, and G_2 the remaining: $G_2 = G \backslash G_1$. Besides, to a loop $u \to u$ corresponds the product $a_{uu}\psi_{uu} = a_{uu} \sum_{l=1}^K c_l(\overline{x}_{lu} y_{lu} - \rho(l))$ and to an edge $u \to v$ $(u \neq v)$ corresponds the product $a_{uv}\psi_{uv} = a_{uv} \sum_{l=1}^K c_l \overline{x}_{lu} y_{lv}$. The same holds for $b_{uu}\varphi_{uu}$ and $b_{uv}\varphi_{uv}$.

In the paper of Bai and Yao (2008) (proof of Theorem 7.1), they show that only three types of components in the graph G contribute to a non-negligible term (see Figure 1):



Figure 1: three major components in the graph G

Because G_1 and G_2 are subgraphs of G, and by the definition in equation (2.1) and (2.2), ψ_e differs from φ_e only through the coefficient c_l or d_l in front. So the difference between ψ_e and φ_e is at most $O(1)$, which means that for the components in the graph G that have $o(1)$ contribution to $En^{K/2}\xi_n^K$ (see Bai and Yao (2008) for detail of ξ_n) should still have $o(1)$ contribution to $En^{K/2}\eta_n^K$. Based



Figure 2: nine major components in the graph $G_1 \bigcup G_2$

on this fact, we get this time that only the influence of the following nine components (in Figure 2) counts. The numbers $k_1, \cdots, k_9$ in Figure 2 stand for the multiplicity of each component, so by degree of each vertex, we also have the restriction that $4(k_1 + \cdots + k_9) = 2K$, which means K should be an even number, denoted as $2p$ for convenience.

From the combinatorics, we have this time

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}n^{K/2}\eta_n^K &= \mathbb{E}\sum_{G_1 \bigcup G_2} a_{G_1}\psi_{G_1} b_{G_2}\varphi_{G_2} \\
&= \sum_{2(k_1+\cdots+k_9)=K} \frac{C_K^2 C_{K-2}^2 \cdots C_2^2 \cdot 2^{k_3+k_6+k_9}}{k_1! \cdots k_9!} \times D_1 D_2 \cdots D_9 + o(1) \\
&= \sum_{k_1+\cdots+k_9=p} \frac{(2p)! \cdot 2^{k_3+k_6+k_9}}{2^p \cdot k_1! \cdots k_9!} \times D_1 D_2 \cdots D_9 + o(1)\ . \qquad (2.4)
\end{aligned}$$

The coefficients in front of $D_1 D_2 \cdots D_9$ is due to the fact that by observing the nine components in Figure 2, we find that each component is made of two edges; first we combine two edges in a group in the total of K edges, that is $C_K^2 C_{K-2}^2 \cdots C_2^2$; second, the first k_1 (also the following $k_2, \cdots, k_9$) groups should be the same, we must exclude the $k_1! \cdots k_9!$ perturbations from the total of $C_K^2 C_{K-2}^2 \cdots C_2^2$; and last, for the three components in the last column of Figure 2, the two edges in each component belong to different subgraphs (one edge in G_1 and the other in G_2), so there should be an additional perturbation

$2^{k_3+k_6+k_9}$ added, and combine all these facts leads to the result.

Then we specify the terms of $D_1, D_2, \cdots, D_9$ in the following:

$$\begin{aligned} D_1 &= \prod_{j=1}^{k_1} \mathbb{E}\Big[a_{u_j u_j}^2 \big\{ \sum_{l=1}^{K} c_l \big(\overline{x}_{l u_j} y_{l u_j} - \rho(l)\big)\big\}^2\Big] \\ &= \prod_{j=1}^{k_1} a_{u_j u_j}^2 \sum_{l,l'} c_l c_{l'} \left[E(\overline{x}_{l1} y_{l1} \overline{x}_{l'1} y_{l'1}) - \rho(l)\rho(l^{'})\right] \\ &= \prod_{j=1}^{k_1} a_{u_j u_j}^2 \sum_{l,l'} c_l c_{l'} A_1 \\ &\triangleq \prod_{j=1}^{k_1} a_{u_j u_j}^2 \alpha_1 \ , \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} D_2 &= \prod_{j=1}^{k_2} \mathbb{E}\Big[b_{u_j u_j}^2 \big\{ \sum_{l=1}^{K} d_l \big(\overline{x}_{l u_j} y_{l u_j} - \rho(l)\big)\big\}^2\Big] \\ &= \prod_{j=1}^{k_2} b_{u_j u_j}^2 \sum_{l,l'} d_l d_{l'} \left[E(\overline{x}_{l1} y_{l1} \overline{x}_{l'1} y_{l'1}) - \rho(l)\rho(l^{'})\right] \\ &= \prod_{j=1}^{k_2} b_{u_j u_j}^2 \sum_{l,l'} d_l d_{l'} A_1 \\ &\triangleq \prod_{j=1}^{k_2} b_{u_j u_j}^2 \beta_1 \ , \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} D_3 &= \prod_{j=1}^{k_3} \mathbb{E}\Big[a_{u_j u_j} b_{u_j u_j} \sum_{l=1}^{K} c_l \big(\overline{x}_{l u_j} y_{l u_j} - \rho(l)\big) \sum_{l=1}^{K} d_l \big(\overline{x}_{l u_j} y_{l u_j} - \rho(l)\big)\Big] \\ &= \prod_{j=1}^{k_3} a_{u_j u_j} b_{u_j u_j} \sum_{l,l'} c_l d_{l'} \left[E(\overline{x}_{l1} y_{l1} \overline{x}_{l'1} y_{l'1}) - \rho(l)\rho(l^{'})\right] \\ &= \prod_{j=1}^{k_3} a_{u_j u_j} b_{u_j u_j} \sum_{l,l'} c_l d_{l'} A_1 \\ &\triangleq \prod_{j=1}^{k_3} a_{u_j u_j} b_{u_j u_j} \gamma_1 \ , \end{aligned}$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
D_4 &= \prod_{j=1}^{k_4} \mathbb{E}\Big[a_{u_j v_j}^2 \big(\sum_{l=1}^{K} c_l \overline{x}_{l u_j} y_{l v_j}\big)^2\Big] \\
&= \prod_{j=1}^{k_4} a_{u_j v_j}^2 \sum_{l,l'} c_l c_{l'} E\big(\overline{x}_{l1} y_{l2} \overline{x}_{l'1} y_{l'2}\big) \\
&= \prod_{j=1}^{k_4} a_{u_j v_j}^2 \sum_{l,l'} c_l c_{l'} E\big(\overline{x}_{l1} \overline{x}_{l'1}\big) E\big(y_{l1} y_{l'1}\big) \\
&= \prod_{j=1}^{k_4} a_{u_j v_j}^2 \sum_{l,l'} c_l c_{l'} A_2 \\
&\triangleq \prod_{j=1}^{k_4} a_{u_j v_j}^2 \alpha_2 \ ,
\end{aligned}
$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
D_5 &= \prod_{j=1}^{k_5} \mathbb{E}\Big[b_{u_j v_j}^2 \big(\sum_{l=1}^{K} d_l \overline{x}_{l u_j} y_{l v_j}\big)^2\Big] \\
&= \prod_{j=1}^{k_5} b_{u_j v_j}^2 \sum_{l,l'} d_l d_{l'} E\big(\overline{x}_{l1} y_{l2} \overline{x}_{l'1} y_{l'2}\big) \\
&= \prod_{j=1}^{k_5} b_{u_j v_j}^2 \sum_{l,l'} d_l d_{l'} E\big(\overline{x}_{l1} \overline{x}_{l'1}\big) E\big(y_{l1} y_{l'1}\big) \\
&= \prod_{j=1}^{k_5} b_{u_j v_j}^2 \sum_{l,l'} d_l d_{l'} A_2 \\
&\triangleq \prod_{j=1}^{k_5} b_{u_j v_j}^2 \beta_2 \ ,
\end{aligned}
$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
D_6 &= \prod_{j=1}^{k_6} \mathbb{E}\Big[a_{u_j v_j} b_{u_j v_j} \big(\sum_{l=1}^{K} c_l \overline{x}_{l u_j} y_{l v_j}\big)\big(\sum_{l=1}^{K} d_l \overline{x}_{l u_j} y_{l v_j}\big)\Big] \\
&= \prod_{j=1}^{k_6} a_{u_j v_j} b_{u_j v_j} \sum_{l,l'} c_l d_{l'} E\big(\overline{x}_{l1} \overline{x}_{l'1}\big) E\big(y_{l1} y_{l'1}\big) \\
&= \prod_{j=1}^{k_6} a_{u_j v_j} b_{u_j v_j} \sum_{l,l'} c_l d_{l'} A_2 \\
&\triangleq \prod_{j=1}^{k_6} a_{u_j v_j} b_{u_j v_j} \gamma_2 \ ,
\end{aligned}
$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
D_7 &= \prod_{j=1}^{k_7} \mathbb{E}\Big[|a_{u_j v_j}|^2 \big(\sum_{l=1}^{K} c_l \overline{x}_{l u_j} y_{l v_j}\big)\big(\sum_{l=1}^{K} c_l \overline{x}_{l v_j} y_{l u_j}\big)\Big] \\
&= \prod_{j=1}^{k_7} |a_{u_j v_j}|^2 \sum_{l,l'} c_l c_{l'} E\big(\overline{x}_{l1} y_{l'1}\big) E\big(\overline{x}_{l'1} y_{l1}\big) \\
&= \prod_{j=1}^{k_7} |a_{u_j v_j}|^2 \sum_{l,l'} c_l c_{l'} A_3 \\
&\triangleq \prod_{j=1}^{k_7} |a_{u_j v_j}|^2 \alpha_3 \ ,
\end{aligned}
$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
D_8 &= \prod_{j=1}^{k_8} \mathbb{E}\Big[|b_{u_j v_j}|^2 \big(\sum_{l=1}^{K} d_l \overline{x}_{l u_j} y_{l v_j}\big)\big(\sum_{l=1}^{K} d_l \overline{x}_{l v_j} y_{l u_j}\big)\Big] \\
&= \prod_{j=1}^{k_8} |b_{u_j v_j}|^2 \sum_{l,l'} d_l d_{l'} E\big(\overline{x}_{l1} y_{l'1}\big) E\big(\overline{x}_{l'1} y_{l1}\big) \\
&= \prod_{j=1}^{k_8} |b_{u_j v_j}|^2 \sum_{l,l'} d_l d_{l'} A_3 \\
&\triangleq \prod_{j=1}^{k_8} |b_{u_j v_j}|^2 \beta_3 \ ,
\end{aligned}
$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
D_9 &= \prod_{j=1}^{k_9} \mathbb{E}\Big[a_{u_j v_j} b_{v_j u_j} \big(\sum_{l=1}^{K} c_l \overline{x}_{l u_j} y_{l v_j}\big)\big(\sum_{l=1}^{K} d_l \overline{x}_{l v_j} y_{l u_j}\big)\Big] \\
&= \prod_{j=1}^{k_9} a_{u_j v_j} b_{v_j u_j} \sum_{l,l'} c_l d_{l'} E\big(\overline{x}_{l1} y_{l'1}\big) E\big(\overline{x}_{l'1} y_{l1}\big) \\
&= \prod_{j=1}^{k_9} a_{u_j v_j} b_{v_j u_j} \sum_{l,l'} c_l d_{l'} A_3 \\
&\triangleq \prod_{j=1}^{k_9} a_{u_j v_j} b_{v_j u_j} \gamma_3 \ .
\end{aligned}
$$

Combine these nine terms with equation (2.4), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}\eta_n^{2p} &= n^{-p}\sum_{k_1+\cdots+k_9=p}\frac{(2p)!\cdot 2^{k_3+k_6+k_9}}{2^p\cdot k_1!\cdots k_9!}\prod_{(j_1\cdots j_9)=(1\cdots 1)}^{(k_1\cdots k_9)} a_{u_{j_1}u_{j_1}}^2\alpha_1^{k_1}b_{u_{j_2}u_{j_2}}^2\\
&\quad\times\beta_1^{k_2}a_{u_{j_3}u_{j_3}}b_{u_{j_3}u_{j_3}}\gamma_1^{k_3}a_{u_{j_4}v_{j_4}}^2\alpha_2^{k_4}b_{u_{j_5}v_{j_5}}^2\beta_2^{k_5}a_{u_{j_6}v_{j_6}}b_{u_{j_6}v_{j_6}}\gamma_2^{k_6}\\
&\quad\times|a_{u_{j_7}v_{j_7}}|^2\alpha_3^{k_7}|b_{u_{j_8}v_{j_8}}|^2\beta_3^{k_8}a_{u_{j_9}v_{j_9}}b_{v_{j_9}u_{j_9}}\gamma_3^{k_9}+o(1)\\
&= \frac{(2p-1)!!}{n^p}\big(\alpha_1\sum_{u=1}^n a_{uu}^2+\beta_1\sum_{u=1}^n b_{uu}^2+2\gamma_1\sum_{u=1}^n a_{uu}b_{uu}+\alpha_2\sum_{u\neq v}a_{uv}^2\\
&\quad+\beta_2\sum_{u\neq v}b_{uv}^2+2\gamma_2\sum_{u\neq v}a_{uv}b_{uv}+\alpha_3\sum_{u\neq v}|a_{uv}|^2+\beta_3\sum_{u\neq v}|b_{uv}|^2\\
&\quad+2\gamma_3\sum_{u\neq v}a_{uv}b_{vu}\big)^p+o(1)\ ,
\end{aligned}$$

which means that $\eta_n \Longrightarrow N(0,\sigma^2)$ by the moment method, with

$$\begin{aligned}
\sigma^2 &= \lim_{n\to\infty}\frac{1}{n}\Big[\alpha_1\sum_{u=1}^n a_{uu}^2+\beta_1\sum_{u=1}^n b_{uu}^2+2\gamma_1\sum_{u=1}^n a_{uu}b_{uu}+\alpha_2\sum_{u\neq v}a_{uv}^2+\beta_2\sum_{u\neq v}b_{uv}^2\\
&\quad+2\gamma_2\sum_{u\neq v}a_{uv}b_{uv}+\alpha_3\sum_{u\neq v}|a_{uv}|^2+\beta_3\sum_{u\neq v}|b_{uv}|^2+2\gamma_3\sum_{u\neq v}a_{uv}b_{vu}\Big]\\
&= \alpha_1w_1+\beta_1w_2+2\gamma_1w_3+\alpha_2(\tau_1-w_1)+\beta_2(\tau_2-w_2)+2\gamma_2(\tau_3-w_3)\\
&\quad+\alpha_3(\theta_1-w_1)+\beta_3(\theta_2-w_2)+2\gamma_3(\theta_3-w_3)\\
&= \sum_{l,l'}c_lc_{l'}A_1w_1+\sum_{l,l'}d_ld_{l'}A_1w_2+2\sum_{l,l'}c_ld_{l'}A_1w_3+\sum_{l,l'}c_lc_{l'}A_2(\tau_1-w_1)\\
&\quad+\sum_{l,l'}d_ld_{l'}A_2(\tau_2-w_2)+2\sum_{l,l'}c_ld_{l'}A_2(\tau_3-w_3)+\sum_{l,l'}c_lc_{l'}A_3(\theta_1-w_1)\\
&\quad+\sum_{l,l'}d_ld_{l'}A_3(\theta_2-w_2)+2\sum_{l,l'}c_ld_{l'}A_3(\theta_3-w_3)\\
&= \sum_{l,l'}c_lc_{l'}\big(A_1w_1+A_2(\tau_1-w_1)+A_3(\theta_1-w_1)\big)\\
&\quad+\sum_{l,l'}d_ld_{l'}\big(A_1w_2+A_2(\tau_2-w_2)+A_3(\theta_2-w_2)\big)\\
&\quad+2\sum_{l,l'}c_ld_{l'}\big(A_1w_3+A_2(\tau_3-w_3)+A_3(\theta_3-w_3)\big)\ .
\end{aligned}$$

The proof of Theorem 2.1 is complete. □

Corollary 2.1. *Under the same conditions as in Theorem 2.1, but with real random vectors* $\{(x_i,y_i)_{i\in N}\}$, *symmetric matrices* $\{A_n=[a_{ij}(n)]\}_n$ *and* $\{B_n=$

$[b_{ij}(n)]\}_n$, *the* $2K$*-dimensional real-valued random vector:*

$$\big(U(1),\cdots,U(K),V(1),\cdots,V(K)\big)^T$$

converges weakly to a zero-mean $2K$*-dimensional Gaussian vector with covariance matrix* B*.*

Theorem 2.1 can be generalized to the joint distribution of several sesquilinear forms. We present this generalization in the following theorem. Recall that in the proof of Theorem 2.1, we use the moment method and find the nine major components presented in Figure 2, which all contain two edges. Therefore, if now we consider the k sesquilinear forms as a whole, there should be $\frac{3}{2}k(1+k)$ major components that will lead to a nonneglectable contribution. And each component still has two edges, from the same subgraph (both from G_i $(i=1,\cdots,k)$ or from two different subgraphs (one from G_i and the other from G_j $(i\neq j)$). This means that the k sesquilinear forms packed together only has pairwise covariance function. Other proofs are similar and omitted.

Theorem 2.2. *Let* $\big\{A_n^{(m)}=[a_{ij}^{(m)}(n)]\big\}_n$ $m=(1,\cdots,k)$ *be* k *sequences of* $n\times n$ *Hermitian matrices and the vector* $\{X(l),Y(l)\}_{1\leq l\leq K}$ *are defined as* (1.1)*. Assume that the following limits exists* $(m,m^{'}=(1,\cdots,k)$ *and* $m\neq m^{'})$*:*

$$w_m=\lim_{n\to\infty}\frac{1}{n}\sum_{u=1}^{n}(a_{uu}^{(m)}(n))^2\ ,\quad w_{mm'}=\lim_{n\to\infty}\frac{1}{n}\sum_{u=1}^{n}a_{uu}^{(m)}(n)a_{uu}^{(m^{'})}(n)\ ,$$
$$\theta_m=\lim_{n\to\infty}\frac{1}{n}\sum_{u,v=1}^{n}|a_{uv}^{(m)}(n)|^2\ ,\quad \theta_{mm'}=\lim_{n\to\infty}\frac{1}{n}\sum_{u,v=1}^{n}a_{uv}^{(m)}(n)a_{vu}^{(m^{'})}(n)\ ,$$
$$\tau_m=\lim_{n\to\infty}\frac{1}{n}\sum_{u,v=1}^{n}(a_{uv}^{(m)}(n))^2\ ,\quad \tau_{mm'}=\lim_{n\to\infty}\frac{1}{n}\sum_{u,v=1}^{n}a_{uv}^{(m)}(n)a_{uv}^{(m^{'})}(n)\ .$$

Denote

$$A_1=\mathbb{E}(\overline{x}_{l1}y_{l1}\overline{x}_{l'1}y_{l'1})-\rho(l)\rho(l^{'})\ ,$$
$$A_2=\mathbb{E}(\overline{x}_{l1}\overline{x}_{l'1})E(y_{l1}y_{l'1})\ ,$$
$$A_3=\mathbb{E}(\overline{x}_{l1}y_{l'1})E(\overline{x}_{l'1}y_{l1})\ .$$

And let

$$U^{(m)}(l)=\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}\big[X(l)^*A_n^{(m)}Y(l)-\rho(l)trA_n^{(m)}\big]\ ,$$

then, the $(K\cdot k)$*-dimensional complex-valued random vector:*

$$\big(U^{(1)}(1),\cdots,U^{(1)}(K),U^{(2)}(1),\cdots,U^{(2)}(K),U^{(k)}(1),\cdots,U^{(k)}(K)\big)^T$$

converges weakly to a zero-mean complex-valued vector W whose real and imaginary parts are Gaussian. Moreover, the Laplace transform of W is given by

$$\mathbb{E}\exp\left(\begin{pmatrix}c_1\\ \vdots\\ c_k\end{pmatrix}^T W\right)=\exp\left[\frac{1}{2}\begin{pmatrix}c_1\\ \vdots\\ c_k\end{pmatrix}^T B\begin{pmatrix}c_1 & \cdots & c_k\end{pmatrix}\right],\qquad c_i\in\mathbb{C}^K\ ,$$

where B could be written as

$$B=\begin{pmatrix}B_{11} & B_{12} & \cdots & B_{1k}\\ B_{21} & B_{22} & \cdots & B_{2k}\\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots\\ B_{k1} & B_{k2} & \cdots & B_{kk}\end{pmatrix}_{(K\cdot k)\times(K\cdot k)},$$

each block is a $K\times K$ matrices with entries (for $l,l^{'}=1,\cdots,K$):

$$B_{ii}(l,l^{'})=Cov\ (U^i(l),U^i(l^{'}))=w_iA_1+(\tau_i-w_i)A_2+(\theta_i-w_i)A_3\ ,$$
$$B_{ij}(l,l^{'})=Cov\ (U^i(l),U^j(l^{'}))=w_{ij}A_1+(\tau_{ij}-w_{ij})A_2+(\theta_{ij}-w_{ij})A_3\ .$$

3. Two applications in large-dimensional spiked population models

It is well known that the empirical spectral distribution of a large-dimensional sample covariance matrix tends to the Marčenko-Pastur distribution $F_y(dx)$:

$$F_y(dx)=\frac{1}{2\pi xy}\sqrt{(x-a_y)(b_y-x)}dx,\qquad a_y\le x\le b_y\ ,$$

where $y=\lim p/n$, $a_y=(1-\sqrt{y})^2$ and $b_y=(1+\sqrt{y})^2$ under fairly general conditions, see Marčenko and Pastur (1967). Moreover, under a fourth moment condition, the smallest and largest sample eigenvalues converge almost surely to the end points a_y and b_y, respectively.

While in recent empirical data analysis, there's always the case that some eigenvalues are well separated from the bulk, so Johnstone (2001) proposed a *spiked population model*, where all the population eigenvalues equal to 1 except some fixed number of them (spikes) for possible explanation of this phenomenon. Clearly, the spiked population model can be considered as a finite-rank perturbation of the *null case* where all the population eigenvalues equal to 1. Then there raises the question that what's the influence of these spikes on the individual sample eigenvalues. Baik et al. (2005) first unveiled the phase transition phenomenon in the case of complex Gaussian variables, stating that when the population spikes are above (or under) a certain threshold $1+\sqrt{y}$ (or $1-\sqrt{y}$), the corresponding extreme sample eigenvalues will jump out of the bulk. In Baik and Silverstein (2006), they consider more general random variable: complex or real and not necessarily Gaussian and derived the same transition phenomenon. As for the central limit theorem, Baik et al. (2005) proposed the result

for the largest eigenvalue in the Gaussian complex case. Paul (2007) found the Gaussian limiting distribution when the population vector is real Gaussian and some other conditions on the population covariance matrix. Bai and Yao (2008) established the central limit theorem for the largest as well as for the smallest sample eigenvalues under general population variables. Related central limit theory of extreme eigenvalues for finite-rank perturbed random matrices has been proposed in Benaych-Georges et al. (2011).

In this section, we establish two new central limit theorems for the extreme sample eigenvalues as well as sample eigenvector projections. First, Section 3.1 gives introductions on the model and some preliminary results. In Section 3.2, a joint central limit theorem is proposed for groups of packed sample eigenvalues corresponding to the spikes (primary CLT in Bai and Yao (2008) concerns only one such group). Next in Section 3.3, assuming the simple spiked case, we derive a joint CLT for the extreme sample eigenvalue and its corresponding sample eigenvector projection. Such CLT is a new result; indeed, we do not know any CLT related to spike eigenvectors from the literature. Finally, both applications are based on the general CLT for random sesquilinear forms in our Theorem 2.1.

3.1. Some notation and preliminary results

Suppose the zero-mean complex-valued random vector $x = (\xi^T, \eta^T)^T$, where $\xi = (\xi(1), \cdots, \xi(M))^T$, $\eta = (\eta(1), \cdots, \eta(p))^T$ are independent, of dimension M (fixed) and p ($p \to \infty$), respectively. And denote $x_i = (\xi_i^T, \eta_i^T)^T$ ($i = 1, \cdots, n$) the n i.i.d. copies of x. Moreover, assume that $E||x||^4 < \infty$ and the coordinates of η are independent and identically distributed with unit variance.

The population covariance matrix of the vector x is then

$$V = \mathrm{Cov}(x) = \begin{pmatrix} \Sigma & 0 \\ 0 & I_p \end{pmatrix} . \tag{3.1}$$

Assume Σ has the spectral decomposition:

$$\Sigma = U \,\mathrm{diag}(\underbrace{a_1, \cdots, a_1}_{n_1}, \cdots, \underbrace{a_k, \cdots, a_k}_{n_k})\, U^*, \tag{3.2}$$

where U is an unitary matrix, the a_i's are positive and different from 1, and the n_i's satisfy $n_1 + \cdots + n_k = M$. Besides, let M_a be the number of $j's$ such that $a_j < 1 - \sqrt{y}$ (here, y is the limit of dimension to sample size ratio: $y = \lim p/n \in (0, 1)$), and let M_b be the number of $j's$ such that $a_j > 1 + \sqrt{y}$. More specifically, if we arrange the $a_i's$ in decreasing order, then Σ could be diagonalized as

$$\mathrm{diag}(\underbrace{\underbrace{a_1, \cdots, a_1}_{n_1}, \cdots, \underbrace{a_{M_b}, \cdots, a_{M_b}}_{n_{M_b}}}_{>1+\sqrt{y}}, \cdots, \underbrace{\underbrace{a_{k-M_a+1}, \cdots, a_{k-M_a+1}}_{n_{k-M_a+1}}, \cdots, \underbrace{a_k, \cdots, a_k}_{n_k}}_{<1-\sqrt{y}}) .$$

The sample covariance matrix of x is

$$S_n = \frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^{n} x_i x_i^* \ ,$$

which can be partitioned as

$$S_n = \begin{pmatrix} S_{11} & S_{12} \\ S_{21} & S_{22} \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} X_1X_1^* & X_1X_2^* \\ X_2X_1^* & X_2X_2^* \end{pmatrix} = \frac{1}{n}\begin{pmatrix} \sum \xi_i\xi_i^* & \sum \xi_i\eta_i^* \\ \sum \eta_i\xi_i^* & \sum \eta_i\eta_i^* \end{pmatrix} \ ,$$

with

$$X_1 = \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}(\xi_1, \cdots, \xi_n)_{M\times n} := \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}\xi_{1:n} \ ,$$
$$X_2 = \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}(\eta_1, \cdots, \eta_n)_{p\times n} := \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}\eta_{1:n} \ .$$

Since M is fixed and $p \to \infty$, $n \to \infty$ such that $p/n \to y \in (0,1)$, the empirical spectral distribution of the eigenvalues of S_n, as well as the one of S_{22}, converges to the Marčenko-Pastur distribution $F_y(dx)$. For real constant $\lambda \notin [a_y, b_y]$, we define the following integrals with respect to $F_y(dx)$:

$$\begin{aligned}
m_0(\lambda) &:= \int \frac{1}{\lambda - x}F_y(dx) \ , \qquad m_1(\lambda) := \int \frac{x}{\lambda - x}F_y(dx) \ , \\
m_2(\lambda) &:= \int \frac{x^2}{(\lambda - x)^2}F_y(dx) \ , \quad m_3(\lambda) := \int \frac{x}{(\lambda - x)^2}F_y(dx) \ , \\
m_4(\lambda) &:= \int \frac{1}{(\lambda - x)^2}F_y(dx) \ , \quad m_5(\lambda) := \int \frac{x}{(\lambda - x)^3}F_y(dx) \ , \\
m_6(\lambda) &:= \int \frac{x^2}{(\lambda - x)^4}F_y(dx) \ , \quad m_7(\lambda) := \int \frac{x^2}{(\lambda - x)^3}F_y(dx) \ .
\end{aligned} \tag{3.3}$$

Let $l_1 \geq l_2 \geq \cdots \geq l_p$ be the eigenvalues of S_n. Let $s_j = n_1 + \cdots + n_j$ for $1 \leq j \leq M_b$ or $k - M_a + 1 \leq j \leq k$. Baik and Silverstein (2006) derive the almost sure limit of those extreme sample eigenvalues. They have proven that for each $m \in \{1, \cdots, M_b\}$ or $m \in \{k - M_a + 1, \cdots, k\}$ and $s_{m-1} < i \leq s_m$,

$$l_i \to \lambda_m = \phi(a_m) := a_m + \frac{ya_m}{a_m - 1}$$

almost surely. In other words, if a spike eigenvalue a_m lies outside the interval $[1 - \sqrt{y}, 1 + \sqrt{y}]$, then the n_m-packed sample eigenvalues $\{l_i, i \in J_m\}$ (associated to a_m) converge to the limit λ_m, which is outside the support of the M-P distribution $[a_y, b_y]$ (here, we denote $J_m = (s_{m-1}, s_m]$ when $m \in \{1, \cdots, M_b\}$ or $m \in \{k - M_a + 1, \cdots, k\}$).

Recently Bai and Yao (2008) derives the CLT for those extreme sample eigenvalues. More specifically, let $\delta_{n,i} := \sqrt{n}(l_i - \lambda_m)$, where $m \in \{1, \cdots, M_b\}$ or $m \in \{k - M_a + 1, \cdots, k\}$, $i \in J_m$, and $\lambda_m = \phi(a_m) \notin [a_y, b_y]$ as defined before. They have proven that $\delta_{n,i}$ tends to the solution v of the following equation:

$$\Big| - \big[U^* R_n(\lambda_m) U\big]_{mm} + v\big(1 + y m_3(\lambda_m) a_m\big) I_{n_m} + o_n(1)\Big| = 0 \ , \tag{3.4}$$

where $\big[U^*R_n(\lambda_m)U\big]_{mm}$ is the m-th diagonal bloc of $U^*R_n(\lambda_m)U$ corresponding to the index $\{u, v \in J_m\}$, and

$$R_n(\lambda) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}\Big\{\xi_{1:n}\big(I + A_n(\lambda)\big)\xi_{1:n}^* - \Sigma tr\big(I + A_n(\lambda)\big)\Big\} ,$$
$$A_n(\lambda) = X_2^*(\lambda I - X_2X_2^*)^{-1}X_2 .$$

Let $R(\lambda)$ denote the $M \times M$ matrix limit of $R_n(\lambda)$, and $\widetilde{R}(\lambda) := U^*R(\lambda)U$. According to (3.4), it says that $\delta_{n,i}$ tends to an eigenvalue of the matrix $(1 + ym_3(\lambda_m)a_m)^{-1}[\widetilde{R}(\lambda_m)]_{mm}$. Besides, since the index i is arbitrary over J_m, all the J_m random variables $\sqrt{n}\{l_i - \lambda_m,\ i \in J_m\}$ converge almost surely to the set of eigenvalues of this matrix. The following theorem in Bai and Yao (2008) identifies the covariance of the elements within the limit matrix $R(\lambda)$. For simplicity, we only consider the real case in all the following or otherwise specified.

Theorem 3.1. *[Bai and Yao (2008)] Assume that the variables ξ and η are real, then the random matrix $R = R_{ij}$ is symmetric, with zero-mean Gaussian entries, having the following covariance function: for $1 \le i \le j \le M$ and $1 \le i' \le j' \le M$*

$$\begin{aligned} &Cov\ (R(i,j), R(i',j')) \\ &= w\Big\{E[\xi(i)\xi(j)\xi(i')\xi(j')] - \Sigma_{ij}\Sigma_{i'j'}\Big\} + \big(\theta - w\big)\Sigma_{ij'}\Sigma_{i'j} \\ &\quad + \big(\theta - w\big)\Sigma_{ii'}\Sigma_{jj'} \ , \end{aligned}$$

where the constants θ and w are defined as follows:

$$\theta = 1 + 2ym_1(\lambda) + ym_2(\lambda) \ ,$$
$$w = 1 + 2ym_1(\lambda) + \left(\frac{y(1 + m_1(\lambda))}{\lambda - y(1 + m_1(\lambda))}\right)^2 .$$

3.2. *Application 1: Asymptotic joint distribution of two groups of extreme sample eigenvalues in the spiked population model*

In this subsection, we consider the asymptotic joint distribution of two groups of extreme sample eigenvalues, say, $\{l_i,\ i \in J_m\}$ and $\{l_{i'},\ i' \in J_{m'}\}$ $(m \neq m')$ when Σ has the structure (3.2), namely the random vector

$$\begin{pmatrix} \{\sqrt{n}(l_i - \lambda_m),\ i \in J_m\} \\ \{\sqrt{n}(l_{i'} - \lambda_{m'}),\ i' \in J_{m'}\} \end{pmatrix} .$$

Following the work of Bai and Yao (2008), we know that this $n_m + n_{m'}$ dimensional random vector converges to the eigenvalues of the symmetric $(n_m + n_{m'}) \times (n_m + n_{m'})$ random matrix

$$\begin{pmatrix} \frac{[\widetilde{R}(\lambda_m)]_{mm}}{1+ym_3(\lambda_m)a_m} & 0 \\ 0 & \frac{[\widetilde{R}(\lambda_{m'})]_{m',m'}}{1+ym_3(\lambda_{m'})a_{m'}} \end{pmatrix} . \tag{3.5}$$

Here, this random matrix (3.5) has two diagonal blocks with dimension n_m and $n_{m'}$, respectively. The covariance function of the elements within each block has been fully identified by Bai and Yao (2008), see Theorem 3.1. But if we consider them as a whole, there's still need to explore the covariance between the elements from the two blocks $[\widetilde{R}(\lambda_m)]_{mm}$ and $[\widetilde{R}(\lambda_{m'})]_{m'm'}$.

We establish such a covariance function in Theorem 3.2 when the observation vector x is real with the help of our Corollary 2.1. However, it can also be generalized to the complex case by considering the real and imaginary parts as two independent real random variables with the help of our Theorem 2.1, readers who are interested in this can refer to Bai and Yao (2008) (see the proof of their Proposition 3.2).

3.2.1. Main result

Theorem 3.2. *Assume that the variables ξ and η are real, then the two diagonal blocks of the $2M \times 2M$ random matrix*

$$\begin{pmatrix} R(\lambda_m) & 0 \\ 0 & R(\lambda_{m'}) \end{pmatrix} \tag{3.6}$$

are symmetric, having zero-mean Gaussian entries, with the following covariance function between each other: for $1 \le i \le j \le M$ and $1 \le i' \le j' \le M$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} &Cov\ (R(\lambda_m)(i,j), R(\lambda_{m'})(i',j')) \\ &= w(m,m')\Big\{\mathbb{E}[\xi(i)\xi(j)\xi(i')\xi(j')] - \Sigma_{ij}\Sigma_{i'j'}\Big\} \\ &\quad + \big(\theta(m,m') - w(m,m')\big)\Sigma_{ij'}\Sigma_{i'j} \\ &\quad + \big(\theta(m,m') - w(m,m')\big)\Sigma_{ii'}\Sigma_{jj'}\ , \end{aligned} \tag{3.7}$$

where

$$\theta(m,m') = 1+ym_1(\lambda_m)+ym_1(\lambda_{m'})+y\left(\frac{\lambda_{m'}}{\lambda_m-\lambda_{m'}}m_1(\lambda_{m'})+\frac{\lambda_m}{\lambda_{m'}-\lambda_m}m_1(\lambda_m)\right),$$

$$w(m,m') = 1+ym_1(\lambda_m)+ym_1(\lambda_{m'})+\frac{y^2(1+m_1(\lambda_m))(1+m_1(\lambda_{m'}))}{(\lambda_m-y(1+m_1(\lambda_m)))(\lambda_{m'}-y(1+m_1(\lambda_{m'})))}\ .$$

Remark 3.1. *If we restrict the index (i,j) to the region $J_m \times J_m$ and (i',j') to $J_{m'} \times J_{m'}$, we can get the covariance function between the two blocks of (3.5). And it should be noticed that the two regions $J_m \times J_m$ and $J_{m'} \times J_{m'}$ do not intersect with each other.*

Remark 3.2. *If the coordinates $\{\xi(i)\}$ of ξ are independent (thus, Σ is diagonal and $U = I_M$), Bai and Yao (2008) has already proved that the covariance matrix within each diagonal block in (3.6) is diagonal; in other words, the Gaussian*

matrix $R(\lambda_m)$ and $R(\lambda_{m'})$ are both made with independent entries. And by noting that the regions $J_m \times J_m$ and $J_{m'} \times J_{m'}$ are disjoint, the only covariance function that may exist between the two blocks is $Cov(R(\lambda_m)(i,i), R(\lambda_{m'})(i^{'}, i^{'}))$ ($i \in J_m$, $i^{'} \in J_{m'}$). Using (3.7) and the fact that $\{\xi(i)\}$ are independent, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&Cov\ (R(\lambda_m)(i,i), R(\lambda_{m'})(i^{'}, i^{'})) \\
&= w(m,m^{'})\Big\{\mathbb{E}[\xi(i)^2\xi(i^{'})^2] - \Sigma_{ii}\Sigma_{i^{'}i^{'}}\Big\} + 2\big(\theta(m,m^{'}) - w(m,m^{'})\big)\big(\Sigma_{ii^{'}}\big)^2 \\
&= w(m,m^{'})\Big\{\Sigma_{ii}\Sigma_{i^{'}i^{'}} - \Sigma_{ii}\Sigma_{i^{'}i^{'}}\Big\} + 2\big(\theta(m,m^{'}) - w(m,m^{'})\big)\big(\Sigma_{ii^{'}}\big)^2 \\
&= 0\ ,
\end{aligned}$$

which means that the two diagonal blocks in (3.5) are independent. Besides, Bai and Yao (2008) has already pointed out the variances within each block:

$$Var(R(i,j)) = \theta\Sigma_{ii}\Sigma_{jj}, \qquad i<j \tag{3.8}$$

$$Var(R(i,i)) = w(E\xi(i)^4 - 3\Sigma_{ii}^2) + 2\theta\Sigma_{ii}^2\ . \tag{3.9}$$

Therefore, if $\{\xi(i)\}$ are independent, then any two groups of packed extreme sample eigenvalues $\{\sqrt{n}(l_i - \lambda_m), i \in J_m\}$ and $\{\sqrt{n}(l_{i^{'}} - \lambda_{m^{'}}), i^{'} \in J_{m^{'}}\}$ are asymptotically independent, converging to the eigenvalues of the Gaussian random matrices $\frac{1}{1+ym_3(\lambda_m)a_m}[R(\lambda_m)]_{mm}$ and $\frac{1}{1+ym_3(\lambda_{m^{'}})a_{m^{'}}}[R(\lambda_{m^{'}})]_{m^{'}m^{'}}$, respectively. And both the Gaussian random matrices are made with independent entries, with a fully identified variance function given by (3.8) and (3.9). Moveover, if the observations are Gaussian, (3.9) reduces to $Var(R(i,i)) = 2\theta\Sigma_{ii}^2$.

3.2.2. Conditions that two groups of packed extreme sample eigenvalues are pairwise independent

An interesting question in the asymptotical analysis of spiked eigenvalues is to know whether two groups of packed extreme sample eigenvalues are asymptotically pairwise independent. In Remark 3.2, we have seen that when $\{\xi(i)\}$ are independent, $\{\sqrt{n}(l_i - \lambda_m), i \in J_m\}$ and $\{\sqrt{n}(l_{i^{'}} - \lambda_{m^{'}}), i^{'} \in J_{m^{'}}\}$ are asymptotically independent.

We aim to relax the independent restriction of $\{\xi(i)\}$ under the condition that all the eigenvalues of Σ are simple, that is, Σ has the spectral decomposition:

$$\Sigma = U \begin{pmatrix} a_1 & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\ 0 & a_2 & \cdots & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots \\ 0 & 0 & \cdots & a_M \end{pmatrix} U^*\ ,$$

where the $a_i^{'}s$ are arranged in decreasing order. We discuss the condition that when the extreme sample eigenvalues are pairwise independent, asymptotically.

Let l_i, l_j denote the extreme sample eigenvalues corresponding to the spikes a_i and a_j, where $a_i, a_j \notin [1-\sqrt{y}, 1+\sqrt{y}]$, and $a_i \neq a_j$. Then, the two-dimensional random vector

$$\begin{pmatrix} \delta_{n,i} \\ \delta_{n,j} \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} \sqrt{n}\big(l_i - \lambda_i\big) \\ \sqrt{n}\big(l_j - \lambda_j\big) \end{pmatrix}$$

converges to the eigenvalues of the following random matrix:

$$\begin{pmatrix} \frac{1}{1+ym_3(\lambda_i)a_i}[\widetilde{R}(\lambda_i)]_{ii} & 0 \\ 0 & \frac{1}{1+ym_3(\lambda_j)a_j}[\widetilde{R}(\lambda_j)]_{jj} \end{pmatrix} .$$

Since all the eigenvalues of Σ are simple, the multiplicity numbers n_i and n_j both equal to 1. Therefore, $[\widetilde{R}(\lambda_i)]_{ii}$ and $[\widetilde{R}(\lambda_j)]_{jj}$ are now two Gaussian random variables (actually, they are the (i,i)-th and (j,j)-th elements of the $M \times M$ Gaussian random matrices $\widetilde{R}(\lambda_i)$ and $\widetilde{R}(\lambda_j)$, respectively, denoted as $\widetilde{R}(\lambda_i)(i,i)$ and $\widetilde{R}(\lambda_j)(j,j)$). As a result,

$$\begin{pmatrix} \delta_{n,i} & \delta_{n,j} \end{pmatrix}^T$$

actually converges to the Gaussian random vector

$$\begin{pmatrix} \frac{1}{1+ym_3(\lambda_i)a_i}\widetilde{R}(\lambda_i)(i,i) \\ \frac{1}{1+ym_3(\lambda_j)a_j}\widetilde{R}(\lambda_j)(j,j) \end{pmatrix}$$

with

$$Var\ \big(R(\lambda_i)(i,i)\big) = w(i)\big\{\mathbb{E}\big[\xi(i)^4\big] - \Sigma_{ii}^2\big\} + 2\big(\theta(i) - w(i)\big)\Sigma_{ii}^2 , \tag{3.10}$$

$$Var\ \big(R(\lambda_j)(j,j)\big) = w(j)\big\{\mathbb{E}\big[\xi(j)^4\big] - \Sigma_{jj}^2\big\} + 2\big(\theta(j) - w(j)\big)\Sigma_{jj}^2 , \tag{3.11}$$

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Cov}\ \big(R(\lambda_i)(i,i), R(\lambda_j)(j,j)\big) &= w(i,j)\big\{\mathbb{E}\big[\xi(i)^2\xi(j)^2\big] - \Sigma_{ii}\Sigma_{jj}\big\} \\ &\quad + 2\big(\theta(i,j) - w(i,j)\big)\Sigma_{ij}^2 . \end{aligned} \tag{3.12}$$

From the definitions of $w(i,j)$ and $\theta(i,j)$, taking the fact that $m_1(\lambda_i) = 1/(a_i - 1)$ (see Lemma 5.1) into consideration, we have,

$$\begin{aligned} w(i,j) &= 1 + ym_1(\lambda_i) + ym_1(\lambda_j) \\ &\quad + \frac{y^2\big(1+m_1(\lambda_i)\big)\big(1+m_1(\lambda_j)\big)}{\big(\lambda_i - y(1+m_1(\lambda_i))\big)\big(\lambda_j - y(1+m_1(\lambda_j))\big)} \\ &= 1 + \frac{y}{a_i - 1} + \frac{y}{a_j - 1} + \frac{y^2}{(a_i-1)(a_j-1)} \\ &= \frac{(y + a_i - 1)(y + a_j - 1)}{(a_i - 1)(a_j - 1)} , \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}\theta(i,j)-w(i,j) &= y\left(\frac{\lambda_j}{\lambda_i-\lambda_j}m_1(\lambda_j)+\frac{\lambda_i}{\lambda_j-\lambda_i}m_1(\lambda_i)\right)\\ &\quad -\frac{y^2}{(a_i-1)(a_j-1)}\\ &= y\cdot\frac{(y+a_i-1)(y+a_j-1)}{(a_i-1)(a_j-1)\big[(a_i-1)(a_j-1)-y\big]}\ .\end{aligned}$$

The values of $w(i,j)$ will always be positive whenever $a_i, a_j \notin [1-\sqrt{y}, 1+\sqrt{y}]$, while $\theta(i,j)-w(i,j)$ will be negative if $a_i > 1+\sqrt{y}$ and $0 < a_j < 1-\sqrt{y}$ (corresponding to one extreme large and one extreme small sample eigenvalues), and positive if $a_i, a_j > 1+\sqrt{y}$ or $0 < a_i, a_j < 1-\sqrt{y}$ (corresponding to two extreme large or two extreme small sample eigenvalues).

Therefore, if any two extreme large (or small) sample eigenvalues are mutually independent (equal to the condition that $\mathrm{Cov}(R(\lambda_i)(i,i), R(\lambda_j)(j,j)) = 0$), a sufficient and necessary condition is

$$\mathbb{E}\big[\xi(i)^2\xi(j)^2\big]-\Sigma_{ii}\Sigma_{jj}=0\ ,$$

and

$$\mathbb{E}[\xi(i)\xi(j)]=0\ (=\mathbb{E}\xi(i)\mathbb{E}\xi(j))\ ;$$

another way of saying this is

$$(*)\quad \begin{cases}\mathrm{Cov}\left(\xi(i),\xi(j)\right)=0 & (\Sigma\ is\ diagonal\ or\ U=I_M)\ ,and\\ \mathrm{Cov}\left(\xi(i)^2,\xi(j)^2\right)=0\end{cases}\ .$$

Obviously, when $\{\xi(i)\}$ are independent, the condition $(*)$ is satisfied.

We consider a special case that the observations are Gaussian, with a diagonal population covariance matrix. This model satisfies condition $(*)$. It is due to the fact that when the observations are Gaussian, uncorrelation between $\xi(i)$ and $\xi(j)$ implies independence, which further implies $\xi(i)^2$ and $\xi(j)^2$ are uncorrelated. Therefore, if the observations are Gaussian and the population covariance matrix is diagonal, then any two extreme large (or small) sample eigenvalues are mutually independent. Furthermore, we can derive explicitly the joint distribution of $\delta_{n,i}$ and $\delta_{n,j}$. According to (3.10), (3.11) and (3.12), we have a much more simplified form due to the Gaussian assumption:

$$\begin{aligned}&Var\ \left(R(\lambda_i)(i,i)\right)=2\theta(i)a_i^2\ ,\\ &Var\ \left(R(\lambda_j)(j,j)\right)=2\theta(j)a_j^2\ ,\\ &\mathrm{Cov}\ \left(R(\lambda_i)(i,i),R(\lambda_j)(j,j)\right)=0\ ,\end{aligned}\tag{3.13}$$

where $\theta(i)=\frac{(a_i-1+y)^2}{(a_i-1)^2-y}$ and $\theta(j)=\frac{(a_j-1+y)^2}{(a_j-1)^2-y}$ by definition. And using the expression $m_3(\lambda)=\frac{1}{(a-1)^2-y}$ (see Lemma 5.1), we finally derive the asymptotic joint distribution:

$$\begin{pmatrix}\sqrt{n}(l_i-\lambda_i)\\ \sqrt{n}(l_j-\lambda_j)\end{pmatrix}\Longrightarrow\mathcal{N}\left(\begin{pmatrix}0\\0\end{pmatrix},\begin{pmatrix}\frac{2a_i^2[(a_i-1)^2-y]}{(a_i-1)^2} & 0\\ 0 & \frac{2a_j^2[(a_j-1)^2-y]}{(a_j-1)^2}\end{pmatrix}\right)\ .$$

But, if we only assume Σ is diagonal, and no Gaussian assumptions are made, things are different. One such example is that $\xi(i)$ and $\xi(j)$ come from the uniform distribution inside the ellipse:

$$\xi(i)^2/16 + \xi(j)^2/36 \leq 1,$$

one can check that $\mathbb{E}\xi(i)\xi(j) = \mathbb{E}\xi(i) \cdot \mathbb{E}\xi(j) = 0$, but $\mathbb{E}\xi(i)^2 = 4$, $\mathbb{E}\xi(j)^2 = 9$ and $\mathbb{E}\xi(i)^2\xi(j)^2 = 24$, that is $\mathbb{E}\xi(i)^2\xi(j)^2 \neq \mathbb{E}\xi(i)^2 \cdot \mathbb{E}\xi(j)^2$, therefore, condition $(*)$ is not satisfied. From this example, we see there could happen that although $\xi(i)$ and $\xi(j)$ are uncorrelated, $\xi(i)^2$ and $\xi(j)^2$ are correlated. And in such a case, even though the population covariance matrix is diagonal, the two extreme large (or small) eigenvalues of the sample covariance matrix may actually have correlation between each other.

A small simulation is conducted below to check this covariance formula according to the two cases mentioned above. The dimension p is fixed to be 200 and the sample size n is fixed to be 300. We choose two spikes $a_1 = 9$ and $a_2 = 4$, which are both larger than the critical value $1 + \sqrt{y}$ $(= 1 + \sqrt{2/3})$. We repeat 10000 times to calculate the empirical covariance value between the largest (l_1) and the second largest (l_2) sample eigenvalues. The first case is the two-dimensional multivariate Gaussian vector $(\xi(1), \xi(2))^T$, which has a joint distribution

$$\mathcal{N}\left(\begin{pmatrix}0\\0\end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix}9 & 0\\0 & 4\end{pmatrix}\right) .$$

According to (3.13), the theoretical covariance value between l_1 and l_2 should be 0, and the empirical covariance value from the 10000 sample simulated turns out to be 0.0019. The second case is the aforementioned uniform distribution inside the ellipse: $\xi(1)^2/36 + \xi(2)^2/16 \leq 1$. This time, the theoretical covariance value between l_1 and l_2 could be calculated as -0.0366 according to (3.12), and the empirical covariance value from the 10000 sample simulated turns out to be -0.0371. The two errors are both smaller than the order $O(1/\sqrt{10000})$ under both cases.

3.3. *Application 2: Asymptotic joint distribution of the largest sample eigenvalue and its corresponding sample eigenvector projection*

In this section, let the population covariance matrix have only one simple spike:

$$V = \mathrm{diag}(a, \underbrace{1, \cdots, 1}_{p-1}) ,$$

where now the Σ in (3.1) reduces to a single number a $(a > 1 + \sqrt{y})$. The sample covariance matrix S_n is also partitioned as before:

$$S_n = \begin{pmatrix}S_{11} & S_{12}\\S_{21} & S_{22}\end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix}X_1X_1^* & X_1X_2^*\\X_2X_1^* & X_2X_2^*\end{pmatrix} = \frac{1}{n}\begin{pmatrix}\sum \xi_i\xi_i^* & \sum \xi_i\eta_i^*\\\sum \eta_i\xi_i^* & \sum \eta_i\eta_i^*\end{pmatrix} ,$$

with

$$X_1 = \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}(\xi_1, \cdots, \xi_n)_{1\times n} := \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}\xi_{1:n} \ ,$$
$$X_2 = \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}(\eta_1, \cdots, \eta_n)_{p\times n} := \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}\eta_{1:n} \ ,$$

which are mutually independent. And we denote $v_4 = \mathbb{E}\xi^4/a^2 - 3$ as the kurtosis coefficient of the first coordinate.

Now suppose l is the largest eigenvalue of S_n, converging to the value $\lambda = \phi(a) = a + ya/(a-1)$, which is outside the support of M-P distribution $[a_y, b_y]$ and let u be the corresponding sample eigenvector with u_1 its first coordinate corresponding to the spike a and u_2 the remaining $p\times 1$ component. We have the following central limit theorem that related to the asymptotic joint distribution of the largest sample eigenvalue l and its corresponding sample eigenvector projection $u_1^* u_1$. (Notice that the population eigenvector corresponding to the spike a is simply $e_1 = (1, 0, \cdots, 0)^T$. Therefore, u_1 represents the inner product between e_1 and the sample eigenvector u.)

Theorem 3.3.

$$\begin{pmatrix} \sqrt{n}\left(u_1^* u_1 - \frac{(a-1)^2 - y}{(a-1)(a-1+y)}\right) \\ \sqrt{n}(l-\lambda) \end{pmatrix} \Longrightarrow \mathcal{N}\left(\begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} v_{11} & v_{12} \\ v_{12} & v_{22} \end{pmatrix}\right) \ ,$$

where

$$v_{11} = \frac{a^2y^2(a^2+y-1)^2}{(a-1)^4(a-1+y)^4}\nu_4 + \frac{2a^2y((a+y-1)^2+ya^2)}{((a-1)^2-y)(a-1+y)^4} \ ,$$
$$v_{12} = \frac{ya^2(a^2-1+y)((a-1)^2-y)}{(a-1)^6(a-1+y)^4}\nu_4 + \frac{2a^3y}{(a-1)(a-1+y)^2} \ ,$$
$$v_{22} = \frac{a^2((a-1)^2-y)^2}{(a-1)^4}\nu_4 + \frac{2a^2((a-1)^2-y)}{(a-1)^2} \ .$$

Remark 3.3. *If the observations are Gaussian, then we have $v_4 = 0$, then the covariance matrix in the above theorem reduces to a much simpler expression:*

$$v_{11} = \frac{2a^2y((a+y-1)^2+ya^2)}{((a-1)^2-y)(a-1+y)^4} \ ,$$
$$v_{12} = \frac{2a^3y}{(a-1)(a-1+y)^2} \ ,$$
$$v_{22} = \frac{2a^2((a-1)^2-y)}{(a-1)^2} \ .$$

Remark 3.4. *Trivially, the following central limit theorem of the eigenvector projection holds*

$$\sqrt{n}\left(u_1^* u_1 - \frac{(a-1)^2-y}{(a-1)(a-1+y)}\right) \longrightarrow N(0, v_{11}) \ .$$

In particular,

$$u_1^* u_1 \xrightarrow{p} \frac{(a-1)^2 - y}{(a-1)(a-1+y)} \ .$$

Observe that this limit $\in (0,1)$*. In particular, the sample eigenvector* u *does not converge to the population eigenvector; only their angle tends to a limit. Notice that the limit of the angle has already been established by Paul (2007) for the Gaussian case and Benaych-Georges and Nadakuditi (2011) on somewhat different but closely related random matrix models with a finite-rank perturbation.*

4. Proof of Theorem 3.2 and 3.3

4.1. Proof of Theorem 3.2

Proof. We prove this result with the help of Corollary 2.1. Consider

$$\begin{pmatrix} \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} u(i)(I + A_n(\lambda_m))u(j)^T \\ \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} u(i')(I + A_n(\lambda_{m'}))u(j')^T \end{pmatrix}_{1 \le i \le j \le M,\ 1 \le i' \le j' \le M} ,$$

with $u(i) = \big(\xi_1(i), \cdots, \xi_n(i)\big)$. Moreover, we define $X(l) = u(i)^T, Y(l) = u(j)^T$, $X(l') = u(i')^T, Y(l') = u(j')^T$, with $l = (i,j)$, $l' = (i', j')$, where l and l' both have $K = \frac{M(M+1)}{2}$ options. Recall the definition of R_n, we have:

$$R_n(\lambda_m) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \Big\{ \xi_{1:n}(I + A_n(\lambda_m))\xi_{1:n}^* - \Sigma \operatorname{tr}(I + A_n(\lambda_m)) \Big\} \ ,$$
$$R_n(\lambda_{m'}) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \Big\{ \xi_{1:n}(I + A_n(\lambda_{m'}))\xi_{1:n}^* - \Sigma \operatorname{tr}(I + A_n(\lambda_{m'})) \Big\} \ .$$

By applying Corollary 2.1, we have

$$\operatorname{Cov}(R(\lambda_m)(i,j), R(\lambda_{m'})(i', j')) = w_3 A_1 + (\tau_3 - w_3)A_2 + (\theta_3 - w_3)A_3 \ .$$

We specify these values in the following:

$$\begin{aligned}
w_3 &= \lim_{n\to\infty}\frac{1}{n}\sum_{u=1}^{n}(I+A_n(\lambda_m))_{uu}(I+A_n(\lambda_{m'}))_{uu}\\
&= 1+\lim_{n\to\infty}\frac{1}{n}\sum_{u=1}^{n}\Big(A_n(\lambda_m)_{uu}+A_n(\lambda_{m'})_{uu}+A_n(\lambda_m)_{uu}A_n(\lambda_{m'})_{uu}\Big)\\
&= 1+ym_1(\lambda_m)+ym_1(\lambda_{m'})+\frac{y^2\big(1+m_1(\lambda_m)\big)\big(1+m_1(\lambda_{m'})\big)}{\big(\lambda_m-y(1+m_1(\lambda_m))\big)\big(\lambda_{m'}-y(1+m_1(\lambda_{m'}))\big)}\ ,\\
&= w(m,m^{'})\ ,\\
\tau_3 &= \theta_3=\lim_{n\to\infty}\frac{1}{n}\sum_{u,v=1}^{n}(I+A_n(\lambda_m))_{uv}(I+A_n(\lambda_{m'}))_{vu}\\
&= \lim_{n\to\infty}\frac{1}{n}\operatorname{tr}\big(I+A_n(\lambda_m))(I+A_n(\lambda_{m'})\big)\\
&= 1+ym_1(\lambda_m)+ym_1(\lambda_{m'})+y\int\frac{x^2}{(\lambda_{m'}-x)(\lambda_m-x)}F_y(dx)\\
&= 1+ym_1(\lambda_m)+ym_1(\lambda_{m'})+y\left(\frac{\lambda_{m'}}{\lambda_m-\lambda_{m'}}m_1(\lambda_{m'})+\frac{\lambda_m}{\lambda_{m'}-\lambda_m}m_1(\lambda_m)\right)\ ,\\
&= \theta(m,m^{`})\ ,
\end{aligned}$$

where we have used Lemma 6.1. in Bai and Yao (2008); and

$$\begin{aligned}
A_1 &= \mathbb{E}(\overline{x}_{l1}y_{l1}\overline{x}_{l'1}y_{l'1})-\rho(l)\rho(l^{'})=\mathbb{E}[\xi(i)\xi(j)\xi(i^{'})\xi(j^{'})]-\Sigma_{ij}\Sigma_{i'j'}\ ,\\
A_2 &= \mathbb{E}(\overline{x}_{l1}\overline{x}_{l'1})\mathbb{E}(y_{l1}y_{l'1})=\mathbb{E}[\xi(i)\xi(i^{'})]\mathbb{E}[\xi(j)\xi(j^{'})]\ ,\\
A_3 &= \mathbb{E}(\overline{x}_{l1}y_{l'1})\mathbb{E}(\overline{x}_{l'1}y_{l1})=\mathbb{E}[\xi(i)\xi(j^{'})]\mathbb{E}[\xi(j)\xi(i^{'})]\ .
\end{aligned}$$

Combine all these, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\operatorname{Cov}(R(\lambda_m)(i,j),R(\lambda_{m'})(i^{'},j^{'})\\
&=w(m,m^{'})\Big\{\mathbb{E}[\xi(i)\xi(j)\xi(i^{'})\xi(j^{'})]-\Sigma_{ij}\Sigma_{i'j'}\Big\}\\
&\quad+\big(\theta(m,m^{'})-w(m,m^{'})\big)\mathbb{E}[\xi(i)\xi(j^{'})]\mathbb{E}[\xi(i^{'})\xi(j)]\\
&\quad+\big(\theta(m,m^{'})-w(m,m^{'})\big)\mathbb{E}[\xi(i)\xi(i^{'})]\mathbb{E}[\xi(j)\xi(j^{'})]\ .
\end{aligned}$$

The proof of Theorem 3.2 is complete. □

4.2. Proof of Theorem 3.3

Proof. Since l is the largest eigenvalue of S_n and u its corresponding eigenvector, we have

$$\begin{pmatrix} l-X_1X_1^* & -X_1X_2^*\\ -X_2X_1^* & lI_p-X_2X_2^*\end{pmatrix}\begin{pmatrix}u_1\\u_2\end{pmatrix}=0\ ,$$

where u_1 is the first component of u, and u_2 is the remaining $p \times 1$ component, and this leads to

$$\begin{cases} (l - X_1X_1^*)u_1 - X_1X_2^*u_2 = 0 \\ -X_2X_1^*u_1 + (lI_p - X_2X_2^*)u_2 = 0 \ . \end{cases}$$

Consequently,

$$u_2 = (lI_p - X_2X_2^*)^{-1}X_2X_1^*u_1 \ , \tag{4.1}$$

$$(l - X_1\left(I_n + X_2^*(lI_p - X_2X_2^*)^{-1}X_2\right)X_1^*)u_1 = 0 \ . \tag{4.2}$$

Moreover, combining (4.1) with the fact that

$$\begin{pmatrix} u_1^* & u_2^* \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} u_1 \\ u_2 \end{pmatrix} = 1$$

leads to

$$u_1^*u_1(1 + X_1X_2^*(lI_p - X_2X_2^*)^{-2}X_2X_1^*) = 1 \ .$$

So, we have

$$\begin{aligned} u_1^*u_1 &= \frac{1}{1 + X_1X_2^*(lI_p - X_2X_2^*)^{-2}X_2X_1^*} \\ &= \frac{1}{1 + \mathbb{E}X_1X_2^*(\lambda I_p - X_2X_2^*)^{-2}X_2X_1^*} + C \\ &= \frac{1}{1 + aym_3(\lambda)} + C \ , \end{aligned}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} C &= \frac{1}{1 + X_1X_2^*(lI_p - X_2X_2^*)^{-2}X_2X_1^*} - \frac{1}{1 + \mathbb{E}X_1X_2^*(\lambda I_p - X_2X_2^*)^{-2}X_2X_1^*} \\ &= \frac{1}{1 + X_1X_2^*(lI_p - X_2X_2^*)^{-2}X_2X_1^*} - \frac{1}{1 + X_1X_2^*(\lambda I_p - X_2X_2^*)^{-2}X_2X_1^*} \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{1 + X_1X_2^*(\lambda I_p - X_2X_2^*)^{-2}X_2X_1^*} - \frac{1}{1 + \mathbb{E}X_1X_2^*(\lambda I_p - X_2X_2^*)^{-2}X_2X_1^*} \\ &:= C_1 + C_2 \ . \end{aligned}$$

Next, we simplify the values of C_1 and C_2.

$$\begin{aligned} C_1 &= \frac{1}{1 + X_1X_2^*(lI_p - X_2X_2^*)^{-2}X_2X_1^*} - \frac{1}{1 + X_1X_2^*(\lambda I_p - X_2X_2^*)^{-2}X_2X_1^*} \\ &= \frac{X_1X_2^*\left[(\lambda I_p - X_2X_2^*)^{-2} - (lI_p - X_2X_2^*)^{-2}\right]X_2X_1^*}{[1 + X_1X_2^*(lI_p - X_2X_2^*)^{-2}X_2X_1^*] \cdot [1 + X_1X_2^*(\lambda I_p - X_2X_2^*)^{-2}X_2X_1^*]} \ . \end{aligned}$$

First, consider the part in the above numerator:

$$\begin{aligned}
&(\lambda I_p - X_2X_2^*)^{-2} - (lI_p - X_2X_2^*)^{-2} \\
&= \left[(\lambda I_p - X_2X_2^*)^{-1} - (lI_p - X_2X_2^*)^{-1}\right] \cdot \left[(\lambda I_p - X_2X_2^*)^{-1} + (lI_p - X_2X_2^*)^{-1}\right] \\
&= (l-\lambda)\left[(\lambda I_p - X_2X_2^*)^{-1} + (lI_p - X_2X_2^*)^{-1}\right] \cdot (\lambda I_p - X_2X_2^*)^{-1}(lI_p - X_2X_2^*)^{-1} \ .
\end{aligned} \tag{4.3}$$

Since $\sqrt{n}(l-\lambda)$ has a central limit theorem with the following expression using our notation (see Bai and Yao (2008)):

$$\begin{aligned}
&(l-\lambda)(1 + aym_3(\lambda) + o(1)) \\
&= X_1(I + X_2^*(\lambda I_p - X_2X_2^*)^{-1}X_2)X_1^* - \mathbb{E}X_1(I + X_2^*(\lambda I_p - X_2X_2^*)^{-1}X_2)X_1^* \ ,
\end{aligned} \tag{4.4}$$

which implies that (4.3) tends to

$$2(l-\lambda)(\lambda I_p - X_2X_2^*)^{-3} + o(1/\sqrt{n}) \ .$$

So

$$\begin{aligned}
C_1 &= 2(l-\lambda)\frac{\mathbb{E}X_1X_2^*(\lambda I_p - X_2X_2^*)^{-3}X_2X_1^*}{(\mathbb{E}[1 + X_1X_2^*(\lambda I_p - X_2X_2^*)^{-2}X_2X_1^*])^2} + o(1/\sqrt{n}) \\
&= \frac{2aym_5(\lambda)}{(1 + aym_3(\lambda))^2} \cdot (l-\lambda) + o(1/\sqrt{n}) \ .
\end{aligned} \tag{4.5}$$

And

$$\begin{aligned}
C_2 &= \frac{1}{1 + X_1X_2^*(\lambda I_p - X_2X_2^*)^{-2}X_2X_1^*} - \frac{1}{1 + \mathbb{E}X_1X_2^*(\lambda I_p - X_2X_2^*)^{-2}X_2X_1^*} \\
&= -\frac{X_1X_2^*(\lambda I_p - X_2X_2^*)^{-2}X_2X_1^* - \mathbb{E}[X_1X_2^*(\lambda I_p - X_2X_2^*)^{-2}X_2X_1^*]}{(1 + X_1X_2^*(\lambda I_p - X_2X_2^*)^{-2}X_2X_1^*)(1 + \mathbb{E}X_1X_2^*(\lambda I_p - X_2X_2^*)^{-2}X_2X_1^*)} \\
&= -\frac{X_1X_2^*(\lambda I_p - X_2X_2^*)^{-2}X_2X_1^* - \mathbb{E}[X_1X_2^*(\lambda I_p - X_2X_2^*)^{-2}X_2X_1^*]}{(1 + aym_3(\lambda))^2} \\
&\quad + o(1/\sqrt{n}) \ .
\end{aligned} \tag{4.6}$$

Let

$$A(\lambda) := I_n + X_2^*(\lambda I_p - X_2X_2^*)^{-1}X_2 \ , \tag{4.7}$$

$$B(\lambda) := X_2^*(\lambda I_p - X_2X_2^*)^{-2}X_2 \ , \tag{4.8}$$

combining with (4.4), (4.5) and (4.6) leads to

$$\begin{aligned}
C &= \frac{2aym_5(\lambda)}{(1 + aym_3(\lambda))^3} \cdot X_1[A - \mathbb{E}A]X_1^* - \frac{X_1[B - \mathbb{E}B]X_1^*}{(1 + aym_3(\lambda))^2} + o(1/\sqrt{n}) \\
&= \frac{2aym_5(\lambda)}{(1 + aym_3(\lambda))^3} \cdot \frac{1}{n}\xi_{1:n}[A - \mathbb{E}A]\xi_{1:n}^* - \frac{\xi_{1:n}[B - \mathbb{E}B]\xi_{1:n}^*}{n(1 + aym_3(\lambda))^2} + o(1/\sqrt{n}) \ .
\end{aligned} \tag{4.9}$$

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned}&\sqrt{n}\cdot\left(u_1^*u_1-\frac{1}{1+aym_3(\lambda)}\right)\\&=\frac{2aym_5(\lambda)}{(1+aym_3(\lambda))^3}\cdot\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}\xi_{1:n}[A-\mathbb{E}A]\xi_{1:n}^*-\frac{\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}\xi_{1:n}[B-\mathbb{E}B]\xi_{1:n}^*}{(1+aym_3(\lambda))^2}+o(1)\ ,\end{aligned}$$

which leads to the fact that

$$\begin{pmatrix}\sqrt{n}\left(u_1^*u_1-\frac{1}{1+aym_3(\lambda)}\right)\\\sqrt{n}(l-\lambda)\end{pmatrix}=\begin{pmatrix}\frac{2aym_5(\lambda)}{(1+aym_3(\lambda))^3}&\frac{-1}{(1+aym_3(\lambda))^2}\\\frac{1}{1+aym_3(\lambda)}&0\end{pmatrix}\cdot\begin{pmatrix}\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}\xi_{1:n}[A-\mathbb{E}A]\xi_{1:n}^*\\\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}\xi_{1:n}[B-\mathbb{E}B]\xi_{1:n}^*\end{pmatrix}+o(1)\ .$$

If we denote

$$D:=\begin{pmatrix}\frac{2aym_5(\lambda)}{(1+aym_3(\lambda))^3}&\frac{-1}{(1+aym_3(\lambda))^2}\\\frac{1}{1+aym_3(\lambda)}&0\end{pmatrix}\ ,$$

and combining with Lemma 5.2, we have got that

$$\begin{pmatrix}\sqrt{n}\left(u_1^*u_1-\frac{1}{1+aym_3(\lambda)}\right)\\\sqrt{n}(l-\lambda)\end{pmatrix}$$

is asymptotically Gaussian with mean $\mathbf{0}$ and covariance matrix

$$DBD^T=\begin{pmatrix}v_{11}&v_{12}\\v_{12}&v_{22}\end{pmatrix}\ ,$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}v_{11}&=\frac{(2aym_5)^2}{(1+aym_3)^6}B_{11}-\frac{4aym_5}{(1+aym_3)^5}B_{12}+\frac{1}{(1+aym_3)^4}B_{22}\\&=\frac{a^2y^2(a^2+y-1)^2}{(a-1)^4(a-1+y)^4}\nu_4+\frac{2a^2y((a+y-1)^2+ya^2)}{((a-1)^2-y)(a-1+y)^4}\\v_{12}&=\frac{2aym_5}{(1+aym_3)^4}B_{11}-\frac{1}{(1+aym_3)^3}B_{12}\\&=\frac{ya^2(a^2-1+y)((a-1)^2-y)}{(a-1)^4(a-1+y)^2}\nu_4+\frac{2a^3y}{(a-1)(a-1+y)^2}\\v_{22}&=\frac{1}{(1+aym_3)^2}B_{11}\\&=\frac{a^2((a-1)^2-y)^2}{(a-1)^4}v_4+\frac{2a^2((a-1)^2-y)}{(a-1)^2}\end{aligned}$$

□

5. Appendix

Lemma 5.1. *For $a \notin [1-\sqrt{y}, 1+\sqrt{y}]$ and $\phi(a) = a + ya/(a-1) \notin [a_y, b_y]$, we have the following relationship:*

$$
\begin{aligned}
m_0 \circ \phi(a) &= \frac{1}{a-1+y} \ , \\
m_1 \circ \phi(a) &= \frac{1}{a-1} \ , \\
m_2 \circ \phi(a) &= \frac{(a-1)+y(a+1)}{(a-1)[(a-1)^2-y]} \ , \\
m_3 \circ \phi(a) &= \frac{1}{(a-1)^2-y} \ , \\
m_4 \circ \phi(a) &= \frac{(a-1)^2}{((a-1)^2-y)(a-1+y)^2} \ , \\
m_5 \circ \phi(a) &= \frac{(a-1)^3}{((a-1)^2-y)^3} \ , \\
m_6 \circ \phi(a) &= \frac{(a-1)^4[(a-1+y)^2+a^2y]}{((a-1)^2-y)^5} \ , \\
m_3 \circ \phi(a) + m_7 \circ \phi(a) &= \frac{a(a-1+y)(a-1)^2}{((a-1)^2-y)^3} \ .
\end{aligned}
$$

Proof. (Sketch of the proof) Recall the definitions of these functions in (3.3), which can all be related to the combinations of the Stieltjes transform:

$$m(\lambda) = \int \frac{1}{x-\lambda} dF(x)$$

and it's derivatives. Besides, $\underline{m}(\lambda)$ (definition and properties can be found in Bai and Silverstein (2004)) satisfies:

$$\lambda = -\frac{1}{\underline{m}(\lambda)} + \frac{y}{1+\underline{m}(\lambda)} \ ,$$

by taking derivatives on both sides with respect to λ and combing with the relationship between $\underline{m}(\lambda)$ and $m(\lambda)$:

$$\underline{m}(\lambda) = ym(\lambda) - \frac{1}{\lambda}(1-y)$$

will lead to the result. Details of the calculations are omitted. □

Lemma 5.2. *With the constants A and B defined in (4.7) and (4.8), we have*

$$\begin{pmatrix} \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}\xi_{1:n}[A-\mathbb{E}A]\xi_{1:n}^* \\ \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}\xi_{1:n}[B-\mathbb{E}B]\xi_{1:n}^* \end{pmatrix} \Longrightarrow \mathcal{N}\left(\begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} B_{11} & B_{12} \\ B_{12} & B_{22} \end{pmatrix} \right) \ ,$$

where

$$B_{11} = a^2 w_1 \nu_4 + 2\tau_1 a^2 \ , \ B_{22} = a^2 w_2 \nu_4 + 2\tau_2 a^2 \ , \ B_{12} = a^2 w_3 \nu_4 + 2\tau_3 a^2 \ ,$$

and

$$w_1 = \frac{(a-1+y)^2}{(a-1)^2} \ , \ w_2 = \frac{y^2}{((a-1)^2-y)^2} \ , \ w_3 = \frac{y(y+a-1)}{(a-1)\cdot((a-1)^2-y)}$$
$$\tau_1 = \frac{(a-1+y)^2}{(a-1)^2-y} \ , \ \tau_2 = \frac{y(a-1)^4((a-1+y)^2+a^2y)}{((a-1)^2-y)^5} \ , \ \tau_3 = \frac{ay(a-1+y)(a-1)^2}{((a-1)^2-y)^3}$$

Proof. Using Corollary 2.1, and let $X(1)^* = Y(1)^* = (\xi_1, \cdots, \xi_n)$, $l = l^{'} = 1$ and $K = 1$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} A_1 &= \mathbb{E}\xi^4 - (\mathbb{E}\xi^2)^2 = a^2(3+\nu_4) - a^2 \ , \\ A_2 &= \mathbb{E}\xi^2\mathbb{E}\xi^2 = a^2 \ , \\ A_3 &= \mathbb{E}\xi^2\mathbb{E}\xi^2 = a^2 \ . \end{aligned}$$

We only have to calculate these values of w_i and τ_i.

First,

$$\begin{aligned} w_1 &= \lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \left(1 + X_2^*(\lambda I_p - X_2X_2^*)^{-1}X_2(i,i)\right)^2 \\ &= 1 + \left(\frac{y(1+m_1(\lambda))}{\lambda - y(1+m_1(\lambda))}\right)^2 + 2ym_1(\lambda) \\ &= \left(\frac{a+y-1}{a-1}\right)^2 \ , \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \theta_1 = \tau_1 &= \lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{n} \operatorname{tr}\left(I_n + X_2^*(\lambda I_p - X_2X_2^*)^{-1}X_2\right)^2 \\ &= 1 + 2ym_1(\lambda) + ym_2(\lambda) \\ &= \frac{(a-1+y)^2}{(a-1)^2-y} \end{aligned}$$

has been proven in Bai and Yao (2008).

Next,

$$w_2 = \lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} [B(\lambda)(i,i)]^2 = \lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \left[X_2^*(\lambda I_p - X_2X_2^*)^{-2}X_2(i,i)\right]^2 \ .$$

Since

$$X_2^*(\lambda I_p - X_2X_2^*)^{-2}X_2(i,i) = e_i^* X_2^*(\lambda I_p - X_2X_2^*)^{-2}X_2 e_i \ , \qquad (5.1)$$

where e_i is the column vector with its i-th coordinate being 1. Recall that

$$X_2 = \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}(\eta_1, \cdots, \eta_n)_{p\times n} := \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}\eta_{1:n} \ .$$

then (5.1) reduces to

$$\frac{1}{n}\eta_i^*(\lambda I_p - X_2X_2^*)^{-2}\eta_i \ . \tag{5.2}$$

Denote X_{2i} as the matrix that removing the i-th column of X_2:

$$X_{2i} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}(\eta_1, \cdots, \eta_{i-1}, \eta_{i+1}, \cdots, \eta_n) \ ,$$

then

$$X_2X_2^* = X_{2i}X_{2i}^* + \frac{1}{n}\eta_i\eta_i^* \ .$$

Using the matrix identity that

$$(\lambda I_p - X_2X_2^*)^{-1} - (\lambda I_p - X_{2i}X_{2i}^*)^{-1} = (\lambda I_p - X_2X_2^*)^{-1}\frac{1}{n}\eta_i\eta_i^*(\lambda I_p - X_{2i}X_{2i}^*)^{-1} \ ,$$

we have

$$(\lambda I_p - X_2X_2^*)^{-1} = \frac{1}{1 - \frac{1}{n}\eta_i^*(\lambda I_p - X_{2i}X_{2i}^*)^{-1}\eta_i} \cdot (\lambda I_p - X_{2i}X_{2i}^*)^{-1} \ ,$$

which leads to

$$(\lambda I_p - X_2X_2^*)^{-2} = \frac{1}{(1 - \frac{1}{n}\eta_i^* \ (\lambda I_p - X_{2i}X_{2i}^*)^{-1}\eta_i)^2} \cdot (\lambda I_p - X_{2i}X_{2i}^*)^{-2} \ ,$$

and (5.2) equals to

$$\frac{\frac{1}{n}\eta_i^*(\lambda I_p - X_{2i}X_{2i}^*)^{-2}\eta_i}{(1 - \frac{1}{n}\eta_i^* \ (\lambda I_p - X_{2i}X_{2i}^*)^{-1}\eta_i)^2} \ ,$$

which tends to the limit:

$$\frac{y\int \frac{1}{(\lambda - x)^2}dF(x)}{(1 - y\int \frac{1}{\lambda - x}dF(x))^2} = \frac{ym_4(\lambda)}{(1 - ym_0(\lambda))^2} \ .$$

Therefore,

$$w_2 = \frac{(ym_4(\lambda))^2}{(1 - ym_0(\lambda))^2} = \frac{y^2}{((a-1)^2 - y)^2} \ .$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
w_3 &= \lim_{n\to\infty}\frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^{n} A(\lambda)(i,i)B(\lambda)(i,i)\\
&= \lim_{n\to\infty}\frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^{n}\left(1+X_2^*(\lambda I_p - X_2X_2^*)^{-1}X_2(i,i)\right)\cdot X_2^*(\lambda I_p - X_2X_2^*)^{-2}X_2(i,i)\\
&= \lim_{n\to\infty}\frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^{n} X_2^*(\lambda I_p - X_2X_2^*)^{-1}X_2(i,i)\cdot X_2^*(\lambda I_p - X_2X_2^*)^{-2}X_2(i,i)\\
&\quad + \lim_{n\to\infty}\frac{1}{n}\operatorname{tr}\left[X_2^*(\lambda I_p - X_2X_2^*)^{-2}X_2\right]\\
&= \frac{y(1+m_1(\lambda))}{\lambda - y(1+m_1(\lambda))}\cdot\frac{ym_4(\lambda)}{(1-ym_0(\lambda))^2} + ym_3(\lambda)\\
&= \frac{y(y+a-1)}{(a-1)((a-1)^2-y)}
\end{aligned}
$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
\theta_2 = \tau_2 &= \lim_{n\to\infty}\frac{1}{n}\sum_{i,j=1}^{n}\left(X_2^*(\lambda I_p - X_2X_2^*)^{-2}X_2(i,j)\right)^2\\
&= \lim_{n\to\infty}\frac{1}{n}\operatorname{tr}\left[X_2^*(\lambda I_p - X_2X_2^*)^{-2}X_2\right]^2\\
&= y\int\frac{x^2}{(\lambda-x)^4}dF(x)\\
&= ym_6(\lambda)\\
&= \frac{y(a-1)^4\left((a-1+y)^2+a^2y\right)}{((a-1)^2-y)^5}
\end{aligned}
$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
\theta_3 = \tau_3 &= \lim_{n\to\infty}\frac{1}{n}\operatorname{tr}[A(\lambda)B(\lambda)]\\
&= \lim_{n\to\infty}\frac{1}{n}\operatorname{tr}\left\{\left(I_n + X_2^*(\lambda I_p - X_2X_2^*)^{-1}X_2\right)X_2^*(\lambda I_p - X_2X_2^*)^{-2}X_2\right\}\\
&= y\int\frac{x}{(\lambda-x)^2}dF(x) + y\int\frac{x^2}{(\lambda-x)^3}dF(x)\\
&= y(m_3(\lambda)+m_7(\lambda))\\
&= \frac{ay(a-1+y)(a-1)^2}{((a-1)^2-y)^3}
\end{aligned}
$$

The proof of Lemma 5.2 is complete. □

References

Bai, Z.D. and Silverstein, J.W. (2004). CLT for linear spectral statistics of large-dimensional sample covariance matrices. *Ann. Probab.*, **32**, 553–605.

Bai, Z.D. and Yao, J.F. (2008). CLT for eigenvalues in a spiked population model. *Ann. Inst. Henri Poincaré Probab. Stat.*, **44**(3), 447–474.

Baik, J., Ben Arous, G. and Péché, S. (2005). Phase transition of the largest eigenvalue for nonnull complex sample covariance matrices. *Ann. Probab.*, **33**(5), 1643–1697.

Baik, J. and Silverstein, J.W. (2006). Eigenvalues of large sample covariance matrices of spiked population models. *J. Multivariate Anal.*, **97**, 1382–1408.

Benaych-Georges, F., Guionnet, A. and Maida, M. (2011). Fluctuations of the extreme eigenvalues of finite rank deformations of random matrices. *Electron. J. Probab.*, **16**, 1621–1662.

Benaych-Georges, F. and Nadakuditi, R.R. (2011). The eigenvalues and eigenvectors of finite low rank perturbations of large random matrices. *Adv. Math.*, **227**(2), 494–521.

De Jong, P. (1987). A central limit theorem for generalized quadratic forms. *Probab. Theory Related Fields.*, **75**, 261–277.

Fox, R and Taqqu, M.S.(1987). Central limit theorems for quadratic forms in random variables having long-range dependence. *Probab. Theory Related Fields.*, **74**, 213–240.

Jakubowski, A. and Memin, J. (1994). Functional central limit theorems for a class of quadratic forms in independent random variables. *Theory Probab. Appl.*, **38**(3), 423–432.

Johnstone, I.M. (2001). On the distribution of the largest eigenvalue in principal components analysis. *Ann. Statist.*, **29**(2), 295–327.

Marčenko, V.A. and Pastur, L.A. (1967). Distribution of eigenvalues for some sets of random matrices. *Math. USSR-Sb*, **1**, 457–483.

Mikosch, T. (1991). Functional limit theorems for random quadratic forms. *Stochastic Process. Appl.*, **37**, 81–98.

Pan, G.M., Miao, B.Q. and Jin, B. (2008). Central limit theorem of random quadratics forms involving random matrices. *Statistics & Probability Letters.*, **78**, 804–809.

Paul, D. (2007). Asymptotics of sample eigenstructure for a large dimensional spiked covariance model. *Statist. Sinica.*, **17**, 1617–1642.

Rotar', V.I. (1973). Some limit theorems for polynomials of second degree. *Theory Probab. Appl.*, **18**, 499–507.

Sevastyanov, B.A. (1961). A class of limit distribution for quadratic forms of normal stochastic variables. *Theory Probab. Appl.*, **6**, 337–340.

Hachem, W., Loubaton, P. Najim, J. and Vallet, P. (2013). On bilinear forms based on the resolvent of large random matrices. *Ann. Inst. Henri Poincaré Probab. Stat.*, **49**(1), 36–63.

Whittle, P. (1964). On the convergence to normality of quadratic forms in independent variables. *Theory Probab. Appl.*, **9**, 103–109.